



RECORDS OF THE BUREAU OF THE MINT

Record Group 104

SELECTED LETTERS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS ABOUT FRANKLIN PEALE

1850 - 1854



THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
Washington: 1960

LETTERS FROM UNITED STATES MINT AND BRANCHES

July 1, 1851-December 31, 1852

Volume 9 (V Series)

Mint of the United States

Philadelphia 13 July 1852.

290

152

Sir,

Many months since, I had the honor to receive from the Department a copy of a memorial addressed to the President of Professor R. S. M^r: Culloch, principally relating to the subject of his method of refining gold, and also impeaching the official conduct of Prof^r: Jas. C. Booth, Melter & Refiner of the Mint, and of Franklin Peale, Chief Coiner. I was directed ~~thereupon~~ "to make the necessary investigations and inquiries into the charges made against the officers of the Mint, and to report the result to the Department; and to report, also, as to the expedience of causing Mr. M^r: Culloch's method of refining gold to be tried at the Mint in his presence."

I first directed my attention to the inquiry relative to the expedience of another refining experiment, and incidentally thereto examined into the charges against the Melter & Refiner which mainly related to his misconduct in former investigations of Mr. M^r: Culloch's process had at the Mint. On these matters I made some time ago, my report to the Department. I also began an examination into the charges against the Chief Coiner, but this has been interrupted, and my report on the subject delayed, by a variety of causes, - partly by sickness, partly by preoccupation in other Mint duties of more pressing importance. Having at length, however, completed the inquiries which I have deemed it proper to institute on this matter, I now present the following ~~annual~~ report.

The charges to be investigated are embraced in the following

para-

paragraph in the memorial of W. M. Cullok; viz: "I refer to the
Chief of the Mint, Franklin Peale, to whose personal hostility
to myself, the result of my having refused, while I was an offi-
cer of the Mint, to furnish him facilities for carrying on an unjust-
ifiable traffic, and mysterious influence with the late Director,
many of the obstacles to the introduction into the Mint of my
improved method of refining are, I am satisfied, ascribable; whose
lavish and unnecessary expenditure of public money, without ade-
quate appropriation or useful effect; whose unofficerlike and de-
moralizing proceedings, whose malicious intermeddling with the
duties of other officers of the Mint, and false representations of their
conduct; and whose appropriation to his own benefit or gain of
that to which he was not legally or justly entitled, - prove him
to be flagrantly unfit for the official position he now holds."

As preliminary to my special inquiry into the above charges, I
requested W. M. Cullok to state the particular facts & circumstan-
ces to which he had thus referred in general terms, and he accord-
ingly presented definite subjects of inquiry under each special item
of charge. This paper of specifications and instances I communi-
cated to W. Peale, who presented his reply thereto. I also received
testimony on matters pertinent to the inquiry from some of the
officers and workmen of the Mint.

After considering the various sources of information open to
me, I am of opinion that, except in one particular to which
I will immediately refer, the official conduct of the Chief Cash-
ier of the Mint has not been amenable to censure, or inconsistent
with his duty to the Government.

I do, however, find it to be true that W. Peale has, at
different times received the services of workmen in the Mint, and

under pay of the Government, for his private benefit, and he
on that ground amenable to that particular charge, by Mr.
Culloh of "appropriation to his own benefit or gain of that
to which he was not legally or justly entitled." The work thus
done was, in the occasional repair of furniture, and in the per-
formance of some trifling jobs at his (rented) house. In stating
this fact, it is but just that I should ~~also~~ refer to some addi-
tional circumstances which may be offered in extenuation.

It is conceded that anterior to the heavy receipts of bullion
from California there were frequently days, and sometimes weeks,
when no employment whatever could be found for the workmen
in the Mint. The deposits received, being dependent on constant
fluctuations of trade, corresponding fluctuations in the demands
on the time of the workmen were a necessary consequence. In
such circumstances, the occupancy of the ~~time~~ workman in per-
forming a private service was not, therefore, an interruption
of any duty which was otherwise due to the Mint. It was
the occupancy of time which would otherwise have been idly
spent. I am assured, by the foreman of the machines "that
Mr. Peale did not take hands away for his private use, at
his house or elsewhere, to interfere with the operations of the
Mint. We had much idle time previous to California gold
(being) crowded upon the Mint. We were idle for days at a
time, and that very often. Sometimes we were nearly all
hands idle for two or three days at a stretch, &c." It seems
also to be agreed that since the time of the men has been fully
occupied, by the receipts from California, no services of the
kind referred to, have been asked for or rendered; and I am

to certain that during my Directorship I have neither noticed
or had reported to me an instance of this character.

I am also well convinced ~~that~~ the gratuitous and extra-
official services rendered by Mr. Poole to the Mint, - in prepar-
ing designs and drafts for new machinery, patterns &c for the
Mint & Branch Mints, - very far exceed in value any private
services complained of, and should be taken into consideration
in any estimate formed of his conduct from the transactions re-
ferred to. And, upon the whole, I am of opinion that, while it must
be conceded that the Chief Coiner has, in the particulars referred
to, departed from the strict line of official duty, no public inter-
est has suffered in consequence.

The final result of the inquiry which, by your instructions, I
have made into the character and conduct of the Chief Coiner certainly
does not lead me to the judgment expressed in the conclusion of the
charges by Mr. McCulloch, that he is "flagrantly unfit for the official
position he now holds". I have, on the contrary, formed the opinion
that ~~the~~ Mr. Poole is eminently fit for that position, by his mechan-
ical talents and general acquirements, by his intimate acquaintance
with the art of mintage in all its departments, by his valuable experi-
ence acquired both in the institutions of Europe and in office here, and
by his close attention and scrutiny into all the details of ~~his department~~ ^{coinage}.
The perfection of the machinery, and the admirable working of his de-
partment, are largely due to his talents and labors, and consti-
tute an enduring test of his official conduct.

It is proper to add that I have acted, in the course of
inquiry made by me in reference to these charges, upon the pre-
sumption that the Department had wished for a report of my

opinion only, as the Chief Officer of the Mint. I have, therefore,
purposely avoided a dry recital of evidence or documents, or any
argumentative commentary thereupon, as these would be tedious,
and I suppose superfluous to the Department.

very respectfully
your obt^d servant

Wm N McKim

Director

W. L. Hodge, Esq.
actg Secy of the Treas, }
Washington. }

Mr. Geo. N. Eckert

Director of the Mint

Philadelphia

15 July 1852

Report on an investigation
made into the official con-
duct of the Chief Carrier

M. K.

M 299
July 16/52
L. H. Hearn

"Lavish & unnecessary expenditure of public money, without adequate appropriation or useful effect."

Specification

1. In that said Franklin Peale, Comr of the Mint, has expended for an engine, boilers, rolls, building, chimney &c. an amount of public money greatly exceeding the sum of \$20,800, the whole amount which was appropriated by an act of Congress approved May 15, 1850, for said objects in conformity with the recommendation of the Director of the Mint contained in his letter of Feb. 26, 1850 to the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting to the attention of said Secretary the official communication of said Peale to said Director dated June 16, 1850, and the accompanying estimate of \$20,800, alleged to have been carefully prepared by said Peale, as a basis for the aforesaid appropriation.

2. Also in that said Peale has caused to be constructed costly, inefficient and useless machinery, such as the large lathe for turning rolls, a steam draw bench, and a set of moulds for casting large ingots not adapted to the coining machinery, with accompanying apparatus for pouring &c., and in that he has wastefully expended public money for fanciful objects, such as a ridiculous trumpet blowing sofa, an excessively ornamented case and stand, &c. a balance &c.

2^d Charge

"Unofficiallike & demoralizing proceedings"

Specification

1. In that said Franklin Peale did, upon the occasion of the visit of President Polk to the Mint, cause to be struck & presented to him a copper medal; for which medal a bill made out in a sum many times ~~the cost~~ ^{greater} than it could possibly have cost, and in the name of George Hall, one of the workmen employed in the Mint, was presented and paid out of the Contingent Fund of the Mint, although the said Hall had not made said medal, and was not the owner and giver thereof. Which facts having become known to, and being disapproved of by some of the officers of the Mint, a contribution was taken up by Mr. Dutton, assistant assayer, for the purpose, it was understood, of refunding to the United States, the money so paid to said Hall, but which money said Peale should himself have restored, or caused to be restored by said Hall.

2. Also that said Peale has repeatedly and improperly required workmen of the Mint, employed and paid by the Government, to labor for his private benefit or purposes, at his dwelling or elsewhere, as well as within the Mint building; and in that said Peale has, without authority of law, made use of the workmen and machinery of the Mint, to carry on an extensive, lucrative and improper business of manufacturing medals, for his own

involvement, and at the expense of the U.S., except for the precious metals contained, and perhaps the copper, or other materials.

3^d. Charge

"Malicious intermeddling with the duties of other officers of the Mint, and false representations of their conduct."

Specifications

1. In that said Franklin Peale did interfere with the official duties of ~~James~~ ~~John~~ Engraver of the Mint, J. B. Longacre, Esq, in relation to the preparation of the dies for coining double-eagles, by withholding from said Longacre the necessary and proper facilities for obtaining impressions. In consequence of which complaint was made, by said Longacre, in writing, to Dr. Patterson, who however was so influenced by said Peale as to induce him urgently to advise said Longacre to resign, for the alleged reason that an imperative communication received from the executive authority of the government, otherwise required him to be removed from office. Whereupon the said Longacre went to Washington, and learned from the Secretary of the Treasury that representations had been made with reference to his ~~off~~ aforesaid official work, calculated to create false impressions, and to procure his removal from office.

2. Also, in that said Peale did, in the year 1849, when I was Melter & Refiner, interfere with my deliveries of ingots to the

Treasurer, - by inducing the Director to request that said deliveries might never be made through the hands of Professor J. B. Reynolds then my accomplished & meritorious assistant, under the pretext that as said Peale usually received ingots in person, at the office of the Treasurer, from his subordinate, Mr. Sprague, a clerk, in the said Peale, insisted that the said ingots should always be delivered by myself, and never by any one of official rank inferior to his own. And which pretext was used by said Peale soon after he had wantonly outraged the feelings of said Reynolds; of which outrage I was separately informed by the said Sprague & Reynolds. Although indignant that a covert insult should have been added by said Peale to the offence he had previously committed against this most estimable & amiable gentleman, who in science morals & manners was in every respect far his superior, I yet agreed to comply with the aforesaid request of the Director partly with a wish to pay due respect to official authority, but chiefly with a hope that I might thereby avert from Mr Reynolds the further malice of said Peale, - a hope in which I was, however, disappointed, if it be true that said Peale did, by his influence with the ^{late} said Director, prevent the due fulfilment of the understanding had with said Reynolds, when he was provisionally employed in the Mint, to wit: that if his services in aid of the Melted & Refi-

over were found to be necessary, then that an appropriation for his salary should be asked for, and his appointment as assistant Minter & Refiner, an office created by law, should be submitted to the President for his approbation. And the breach of such understanding compelled him in self respect to withdraw from the Mint; which lost to the Government the services of a valuable officer, and to our country his life; for on the business in which he was obliged afterwards to seek a livelihood, while in the zealous performance of his duty he was killed by an explosion. In lieu of this unfortunate scientific gentleman, whose services were found to be necessary even while I was Minter & Refiner of the Mint, and must have been far more so since, by reason of increasingly heavy work and the habitual and unprecedented absence of my successor from the Mint, during a great proportion of the time when he should have been in his office, but was absent attending to private business, - there was substituted a young relative, if I have been correctly informed, of the late Director, possessing no appropriate scientific qualifications for an assistant to the Minter & Refiner of the Mint, and whose employment, being neither provisional in emergency, nor contingent upon appropriation & approval by the President, as was that of Mr. Reynolds, but designed to be permanent, without regular appointment or appropriated salary, and without the execution of a bond with security, or the

obligation of an oath, as required by an act of Congress, approved January 18th 1837, has therefore been, and now is, in derogation of law.

4th Charge

"Appropriation to his own benefit or gain of that to which he was not legally entitled"

Specification

1. In that said Franklin Pease has, as aforesaid, repeatedly required workmen of the Mint to labor for his benefit, appropriating to himself the value of said labor; and especially in that he has carried on, in the Mint, an extensive business of manufacturing medals for sale; without authority of law; at the expense of the United States, except for the metals wherewith they were made, and, perhaps, some other materials; and without just distribution of the profits of said business to the workmen who performed the labor.

(signed) Rich^d. S. McCulloch
Princeton, Sept 24th, 1857

1501
Chief Coiners Office U. S. Mint
Philadelphia April 15th 1852

Dr. Geo. W. Eckert,
Director of the Mint.
Sir,

I have received your communication enclosing for my perusal (1) a memorial from Mr. W. A. McCulloch to the President, accompanying a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury dated 11th of Aug. 1851; (2) a second letter from the Secretary of the Treasury of Aug. 12th; (3) a letter from Prof. W. A. McCulloch of Sept. 4th last; (4) a letter & specifications from the same gentleman of Sept. 25th. These documents having, as you state, more or less reference to charges by that gentleman animadverting upon my conduct, which you were instructed by the Department to inquire into, you have felt it your duty to lay them before me, that I may, if I see fit, place on record a written reply thereto. Thanking you for the opportunity thus afforded to me, I now ask your consideration to the following statements in refutation of the charges brought against me. I shall present them in the order which Mr. McCulloch has followed in his so called specifications.

Previous to entering upon this task, I will however call your notice to an untrue allegation which he makes in his memorial, which it is the more important to consider inasmuch as it will be seen that the motives which have influenced Mr. McCulloch are malicious, and that his charges are made in revenge for my having, as he states, opposed the introduction into the Mint of a process patented by him, in the sale of which to

the Government, he had a large pecuniary interest. For he says expressly that to "my mysterious influence with the late Director many of the obstacles to the introduction into the Mint of his improved process of refining are, he is satisfied, ascribable". And he also, apparently, refers to the alleged "deference" of the Melter & Refiner to myself as presenting a little difficulty.

I now assert most positively & without reserve that no opposing influence whatever has been attempted by me in reference to the refining process of Mr. McCulloch. On the contrary, I have earnestly desired that all processes should be tried, and that any one by which the facilities of the Mint could be increased should be successful. It was a subject of regret to me when I learned that the experiments by Mr. McCulloch's process had not given satisfaction. It is perhaps unnecessary for me to adduce proof on this subject, in the absence of any testimony offered other than Mr. McCulloch's unsupported assertion. I, however, send herewith a letter from the late Director, in which he explicitly states that I "always expressed a favorable opinion of the process" and that he does not recollect to have heard from me a single suggestion adverse to the plan.

The "mysterious influence" with the late Director, Dr. R. M. Patterson, which is charged against me is, I suppose, the friendship which began with our Fathers, and has endured between us for 25 or 30 years, sixteen of which have been passed in the mutual relations of Director & operative officer of the Mint. My esteem for him has been unbounded & undeviating, and I hope & flatter myself

that a portion of his has been awarded to me. Perhaps these sentiments may be "mysterious" to Mr. McCulloch, and I shall make no attempt to disturb him in his opinions.

The alleged "deference" to me of the *Melter & Refiner*, Mr. Booth, though a very flattering imputation I must humbly disclaim; and had it even any existence it would have had no effect with reference to the process of Mr. McCulloch respecting which, as I have already said, I was favorably disposed. But Mr. Booth is competent to form his own judgment & to perform his own duties, and any interference of mine would be a little unjustifiable & ridiculous.

I now pass to consider the particular specifications of misconduct which Mr. McCulloch alleges against me.

The first charge is "lavish and unnecessary expenditure of public money without adequate appropriation or useful effect."

Before examining the instances which he alleges in support of this charge, I will remind you that the entire responsibility of Mint expenditures devolves, in law, upon the Director alone. It is he who gives a warrant for the payment of every bill, and if an expenditure is made without his authority, express or implied, he has the remedy in his own power. All that the operative officer can properly do is to suggest or recommend to the Director the objects of expenditure; the decision is with the Director alone.

I would again remind you that the Mint expenses are examined by the auditing & controlling

departments at Washington, whose duty it is to see that they are in conformity to law. To assert that a Mint Officer has expended money "without adequate appropriation" is to charge a gross neglect of duty upon those departments.

But I do not wish to screen myself on technical grounds, I am quite willing to assume the responsibility of the expenditures made in my department, and therefore stand ready to justify those which Mr McCulloch has particularly instanced in his Specification.

He refers, first, to the fact that an appropriation of \$20,800 made May 15, 1850, for an engine, boilers, rolls, building, chimney &c. which was made at the request of the Director of the Mint, upon an estimate prepared by me, proved insufficient for the purposes designed. It is quite possible that such was the case. The accounts for this expenditure are kept with the general contingent expenses of the Mint, and I have not thought it of importance to endeavor to separate them. But conceding that the cost exceeded the amount estimated, to charge such a fact as an official misdemeanor is something unheard of. The difficulties of an accurate estimate are well known; and if the actual cost somewhat exceeded what I had supposed, it is what has happened to thousands of others whose reputation has never been impeached on that account. It is not charged that the estimate was made with dishonest purpose, - or that the expenditures actually made were for a useless or improper object, - or that they were extravagant in their cost, - and I do not therefore perceive in what possible way I am concerned to defend myself

from this allegation. I therefore pass on to consider the other cited instances of "lavish & unnecessary expenditure".

The "large lathe for turning rolls" was devised & executed when cast iron chilled rolls were used, and was then indispensable to keep them in order. Since the introduction of cast steel rolls, I am very happy to say it is of much less importance. It will nevertheless be found sometimes necessary for repairs & forms an important part of Mint machinery.

The "steam draw bench" which I refer to was made for the Charlotte Branch Mint, under my supervision at the request of the Director of the Mint. On trial it did not prove sufficiently manageable. It was, therefore, altered, and is now in satisfactory use at that place.

With reference to the "set of moulds for casting large ingots, not adapted to the coining machinery, with accompanying apparatus for pouring" &c, the facts are as follows. When Mr. C. B. Reiser of the Mint, about the year 1836 or 7. I devised & prepared, by authority of the Director, a system of melting & casting ingots similar to that employed at the British Mint, which after a careful examination of the Mints of France, England & some portions of Germany, I had found the best in use, not only in regard to the amounts melted, but to the perfection of pouring and casting. This system was put in successful operation, but was discontinued, at the request of the Director, in consequence of the inadequacy of the rolling department. I have not by any means changed my views in reference to this

department of Mint operations, and entertain the conviction that this beautiful, economical and efficient system of melting and casting is the best known or practised in any Mint in the world. If we should again have a large business in silver to transact, I believe it will be found expedient again to have recourse to it, in which case the pouring machine and rolls will also be available.

The "ridiculous trumpet blowing sofa" was made for my office by the Carpenter of the Mint when his services were not required for more important work. It is of white pine & painted; the sofa or settee as plain as possible; the upholstery & appendages principally if not entirely the work of my own hands. The alarm which it is capable of sounding may or may not be considered an important safeguard in the premises. You have had the sofa in your own office, and can judge whether it is not a useful rather than a "fanciful" object, as asserted, and whether the most "ridiculous" matter connected with it is not the charge of misdemeanor in office for its construction.

The "excessively ornamented case & stand for a balance" you have frequently had an opportunity of examining for yourself. The stand is of cast iron of simple design; the case, though somewhat ornate is not of costly character. The whole arrangement is in consistency with what was requisite for an instrument designed as a model balance, and constantly ⁱⁿ use for one of the most delicate & important operations of the Mint, that by which the integrity of the deliveries of coin from the Coiner to the Treasurer

and thence to the public, is and has been maintained.

But as Mr McCulloch has adverted to this subject, I hope I shall be excused if I occupy some further space; for in this matter I boldly claim to have done for the Mint & my country much that will entitle me to gratitude, and which cannot be altered by a paragraph or insinuation.

When employed on a special mission in Europe in relation to the whole field of Mint operations, & collateral subjects, the balances for weighing claimed a portion of my attention. I saw the indispensable importance of securing instruments of this kind which by their simplicity & philosophical construction should be reliable in their indications, and not easily subject to derangement. When appointed to office in the Mint I gave to this important subject my best powers of reflection & experiment. In the result, I have produced balances, made from my own drawings, and under my ~~own~~ personal inspection, which after trials, in daily use, for many years, have been found entirely satisfactory to a degree I am confident hitherto unattained in any other country. My labors in perfecting these instruments have been freely bestowed without charge or compensation, or other benefit to myself personally than results from the confidence & satisfaction which result from their use. Previous to their construction it was a common, mild saying that no two weighings could be made alike. Now, every anxiety from this source is, I am happy to say, entirely removed.

I will remark, that of the many balances, large & small, made under my supervision for

The Mint, Mr. McCulloch has hunted up the single instance in which ornament has been introduced, but he could not see seventy or eighty others, in which there is no ornament whatever save "beauty of fitness", and in which the designs are carefully digested both to avoid expense & for facility of construction. The objects & results of my experiments & improvements in this department being developed in an article on Balances which I published in the Franklin Institute Journal, I have the pleasure herewith to send you a copy of the same.

The second head of charges against me is for "unofficerlike & demoralizing proceedings."

The first specification alleged by him, under this head, is that on the occasion of President Polk's visit to the Mint, I caused to be struck & presented to him a copper medal; that I charged the Mint therewith, having caused a bill for many times its cost to be made out, in the name of Geo. Hall, a workman; that the payment being disapproved by some of the officers, a contribution to refund the amount was tacked up by Mr. Du Bois Assistant Assayer

It is quite true that a medal was struck as stated, and it certainly appears to me that the occasion was an appropriate one. It is certainly a very bold charge that a proceeding was "unofficerlike & demoralizing" which took place in the presence of the President, Vice President, Attorney General & other Government officers, as well as of the Director of the Mint.

It is not true that I "charged the Mint therewith." No charge was ever made or contemplated for the medals struck on that occasion. "The

cases and gilding, which were done outside of the Mint, were alone charged for. It appears from the records that the bill was made out in the name of Mr Hall, the weigher in my department. Whether he personally ordered the articles I do not know. He generally purchases the trifling materials required in that office, and renders bills therefor; and frequently also has attended to the purchase of medal cases. But, in truth, of the circumstances attending this particular transaction I have no recollection whatever. It appears, however, that the bill against the Mint was withdrawn, and the amount paid by a contribution from the officers, collected by Mr. DuBois, Assistant Assayer. The letter from that gentleman to yourself explains the whole transaction, and I leave it to your judgment to detect the extent to which it was an "unofficial & demoralizing proceeding."

The second charge specification under the above head of charges being covered by the fourth charge, my reply to the latter will be found a complete answer. I therefore pass on to consider the third charge.

The third charge is for "malicious intermeddling with the duties of other officers of the Mint, and false representations of their conduct."

The first instance alleged is, that I withheld from J. B. Longacre, Esq. Engraver of the Mint the necessary facilities for obtaining impressions of the double-eagle die; that he made complaint thereof to the Director, but that I influenced the latter to advise him to resign, on the alleged

ground of an imperative communication from Government; that the Engraver thereupon visited Washington & learned from the Secretary that representations had been made relative to his aforesaid official work, calculated to create false impressions, and to procure his removal from office.

In connection with this subject, you have also communicated to me a letter of Mr. Longacre to yourself of Nov. 13, 1851, in which he presents statements supposed to be in corroboration of this charge.

That I have ever interfered with the duties of the Engraver of the Mint I most emphatically deny. I, on the contrary, assert that I have at all times furnished him with every proper facility which it was in my power to offer in the prosecution of his official labors; whether by the services of the workmen or apparatus in my department, or by information on details with which I became acquainted when on a visit to the Mint of Europe. To cite a single instance, I will mention that on the occasion of the gold dollar & double eagle being legalized by the action of Congress I caused him to be supplied with discs of proper curvature without delay; his model was electrotyped under my personal inspection, and, after the casting was made, placed in the lathe with my own hands, and the reductions made without the loss of an hour, or even minute available time; and throughout the whole process, to the striking of the coin, I gave all the assistance in my power, being most anxious that

the desires of the Public should be met with the least possible delay.

I am not assured that any workman in the Mint, although many have witnessed the operation, could have made the reduction referred to, but I am certainly assured that Mr. Longacre could not have done it. This fact, and I need not refer to others, render it almost incomprehensible to me that Mr. Longacre should have been called in to give evidence of obstruction under such circumstances.

So far from there having been interferences with the Engraver, on my part, the acts alleged were on the contrary required from my official position. That they have been misconstrued I regret; but under similar circumstances I should certainly feel constrained to a similar conduct.

That I may be understood I will briefly state, as a proposition which cannot be disputed, that the Chief Coiner is the only official and competent judge of what is proper in the depth, curvature, & other mechanical qualities of dies intended for coining money, and therefore, so far as these qualities are concerned, is bound to exercise his judgment & give his opinion. It is necessary that the work of the Engraver should conform to the exigencies of the ~~admirable~~ operation of coinage & the materials of which the dies are constructed. To secure these results, and for no other object, I have exercised an undoubted right of judgment on the work of Mr. Longacre.

Contrary to my advice & expressed

opinion, the dies for the double^{-eagle} were made with a depth of design & other defects which made them unsuited for the purpose of coinage. They were medal dies rather than coinage dies, a difference which will be well understood by any professional die-sinker for coins. As a necessary consequence they would give way under the excessive labor of coinage, and so in fact it proved; for all satisfactory purposes the double eagle dies were destroyed within an hour.

It is a well known fact that from the delays in the Engravers office in producing dies, first for the gold dollar, then for the double eagle, a great deal of public censure was excited; this was visited sometimes upon the Director, sometimes upon the Chief Coiner, sometimes upon the whole body of officers, but never, that I am aware, upon the only officer on whom the responsibility rested. It was at last announced that the dies were complete, and the Secretary of the Treasury had given authority to strike the coin. The impossibility of using the dies in actual coinage would, I had no doubt tend to create public disappointment from the continued delay. As it was my duty to report the failure to the Director, I determined, in view of the circumstances to place that report in writing. It was in the following words.

Mint of the United States
Phila^a, Dec. 24. 1849

Sir,

It is with extreme regret, and after the most

earnest endeavors to overcome the difficulty, that I am compelled to inform you that the impression upon the new die for the double eagle cannot be brought up by the usual coining process. The depth of the head of the obverse is such, that the steel will not sustain the degree of pressure necessary for a perfect impression. To this is to be added the minor disadvantage of the projection of the head beyond the border of the coin, preventing its being "filed" (as it is technically expressed,) and exposing it to abrasion.

Very respectfully

Your Obedt Servt

(Signed) F. Peale

Chief Coiner

Br. R. M. Patterson
Director

Whether the above letter had any influence in the subsequent acts ~~relative~~ to the continuance of Mr. Songacre in his office I cannot pretend to say; but I do positively assent that the insinuation by Mr. Songacre that I was the "source for the hostility" to which he attributes those acts is entirely without foundation. It will not be pretended, I presume, that there was an impropriety in my official letter to the Director, nor that the facts therein stated were untrue, being notorious in the Mint.

Indeed, no other proof of the imperfection of the original dies need be adduced than the fact that they had to be cut down before they could be fitted for the mechanical operation of coinage. But while effecting this object, the relief of the figure of Liberty has been necessarily injured in some parts, while in

others it is still too great, and it remains, on the whole, a coin very far from creditable to the country. If Mr. Longacre had the merit ^{as} of a die-sinker which he arrogates to himself (he says that he has "never known his character as an artist to be seriously assailed,")-it is strange that he should allow his reputation to be perilled by continuing to submit to the criticism of judges and artists, at home and abroad, so imperfect a specimen of his professional talents, more particularly as his almost uninterrupted leisure has given him ample opportunity to review his first attempt. It is perfectly well known that since the process of reproducing dies, by mechanical means was introduced by me into the Mint, the office of Engraver has become a sinecure, except when Congress orders a new coin, involving the necessity of a new original die. Since the double eagle die was finished the Engraver's official labors have consisted in mucking (by the aid of a regularly educated die sinker from New York) the new dies for the three cent piece, and in striking in the dates of the year, on the dies reproduced in the coining department, a matter within the capacity of an ordinary mechanic. He has, therefore, had ample opportunity not simply of making new original double eagle dies, but also of improving the artistic beauty of the whole series of our coins; an opportunity of which an ambitious or competent artist could hardly have failed to avail himself.

It has been made a subject of complaint that I declined to let Mr. Songacoe have one of the first impressions, in gold, of his double eagle die. To this I reply that the Engraver had in his own possession all the usual, and as it is supposed, satisfactory means of taking impressions employed by die-sinkers, and I besides offered him every facility of inspection as well as impressions in silver or any other metal equally well suited to the Engraver's purposes. To assert that there was any peculiar importance in having the impression in Gold is to me inexplicable. The die-sinker does not require a proof-impression in gold, before he completes his work; on the contrary, the only impression in gold which he ever sees is that on the completed medal. — ^{Mr. Songacoe's real object, and now you are convinced of it} I believed, then, that I knew it. It was to exhibit the pieces asked for as triumphant evidences of his success, and by way of confuting, to ignorant parties, the fact of the unsuitness of the dies for coinage; for it is well known that a few single impressions from dies, with the depth & characteristics of a medal can be very well made by a single, but excessive application of the power of the coining press, and to the eyes of the public will present a bold, effective, and it may be attractive appearance, but the experienced in the operation of coining show that the dies must soon fail, and the machinery suffer under the excess of labor to which they are subjected. As the piece asked for was in my legal custody alone, and as I did not choose to permit Mr. Songacoe to use it for the purpose of taking a snap judgment which should controvert facts known to every practical man in

the Mint, I very properly declined to hand it to him.

I have dwelt, perhaps unnecessarily, upon this subject which I now dismiss, merely adding that I was not "cognizant of" or "mainly instrumental" in a supposed attempt to substitute a different design for the three cent piece than that made by the Engraver and am quite ignorant of any such design. I do not know of any one in the Mint who had such a desire.

The second Specification under the head of malicious intermeddling with other officers of the Mint, occupies over two pages of letter paper, and I cannot present it even in abstract, so vague are the charges. My answers will, however, sufficiently indicate them.

It is mentioned that I declined to receive ingots "through the hands of Prof. J. B. Reynolds then (Mr. Mculloh's) accomplished & meritorious assistant."

The facts are simply these. It had always been the custom for the Melter & Refiner to deliver, & the Chief Coiner to receive, ingots in person. On one of these occasions I was surprised to find Mr. Reynolds in the usual place of the Melter & Refiner. I sought an interview with the Director and asked what was Mr. Reynolds position, whether an assistant to the Melter & Refiner, or a Clerk, or a workman, in either of which contingencies I should, as an equal right, ask to employ some one to aid me in a similar capacity in my own department, or that the Melter & Refiner should attend in person as heretofore.

His reply was that he was recognized and
paid as a workman, and he directed Mr.
McClure, to direct the ~~works~~ as before. It was by
Mr. Cullum, therefore, ~~that~~ that Mr. Reynolds was
placed in a subordinate position, and while
he occupied that position ~~and~~ ~~as~~ high as
was my regard for him & my admiration for
his talents; my official self-respect required
of me the conduct which I pursued.

It is insinuated that I influenced
the late Director to the non-fulfilment of an
alleged understanding that Mr. Reynolds should
be appointed Assistant Melter & Refiner, if
his services should be found necessary, and
that consequently Mr. Reynolds had in self-
respect, to withdraw from the Mint, "which
lost to the government the services of a val-
uable officer, and to our country his life".

In reply to all this, I state that I
had nothing whatever to do, directly or indi-
rectly, with Mr. Reynolds appointment or
non-appointment, or withdrawal from the
Mint. I knew nothing of the causes, and
~~had~~ about the same degree of influence in regard
to the circumstances as I had in the explosion
of the boiler by which, much to the regret of
every man of common humanity he lost his
life, an event foisted into these charges with
no other view, apparently, than to make
capital of moral feeling against me. But
this I know, that I subsequently found him
in a position vastly better suited to his tal-
ents, and far more likely to improve his pe-
cuniary resources, than the subordinate one
in which Mr. McClure placed him.

I am also, apparently, made responsible for the scientific demerits of a young man selected by the present Melter & Refiner to fill a place similar to the one occupied by Mr. Reynolds. This is a matter with which, manifestly, I have no special concern. I will, venture, however, the remark that the place filled by the person whose character he assails is not that of "assistant to the Melter & Refiner of the mint" so that it is not to be expected that he should possess "appropriate scientific qualifications for" a post he does not pretend to occupy. He is a workman who aids the Melter & Refiner in making up melts, in weighings & other such matters appropriate to an operative, for which he receives workman's wages. I may add that no melter & Refiner but Mr. McCulloch appears even to have asked for an assistant, under the mint law; and the fact that none has been found necessary, notwithstanding the heavy business of late years, may furnish the true reason why the Director declined to ask the President to authorize such an office, when Mr. McCulloch made the request.

The fourth & last charge made against me is for "appropriation to his own benefit, or gain, of that to which he was not legally or justly entitled."

The first specification under this head is that I repeatedly required workmen of the Mint to labor for my benefit.

It is well known, and the statistics

of coinage, more the fact, that there are frequently times (and particularly was this so before the opening of the California mines) during which the workmen of the Mint are not occupied. The nature of the business is such depending as it does upon the influx & efflux of precious metals, that intervals of pressure & cessation are alternate. Periods of considerable length have sometimes occurred in which it was impossible to find employment for the workmen. Under such circumstances, I freely admit that I have sometimes accepted voluntary services, always of a trifling character, and have asked like services, which have been rendered. But I have never required them, as alleged, and I also aver that the operations of the Mint were never in the slightest degree impeded or neglected on that account, and that satisfactory remuneration or other services have been made in return for such favors.

The next instance of misappropriation specified against me is that I manufacture at the Mint medals for sale "without authority, of law, at the expense of the United States ~~expense~~ for the metals whereof they were made, & perhaps some other materials, and without just distribution of the profits of said business to the workmen who performed the labor."

The business of striking medals at the Mint was prosecuted before I entered the Mint by my predecessor in office, the

late venerable & much loved Adam Eckifolds, who was commissioned by Genl. Washington, & served the Government during about half a century, with a degree of faithfulness & devotion, with a purity of heart & purpose rarely if ever excelled. It is this exemplary man who has been virtually attacked by Mr. McCulloch.

Although the striking of medals is very appropriate to the constitution & organization of the Mint, yet there is nothing in existing laws which requires any services of that kind of the Chief Coiner or any other officer. Yet, from the administration of Washington, the general government has felt the necessity of calling in the aid of the Chief Coiner to prepare the national medals. In so doing it has always treated with that officer on a private footing, and has compensated him for his trouble. It cannot surely be alleged as an impropriety that for private services thus rendered at the ~~request~~ request of the Government, and paid by Government, the Chief Coiner is liable to censure.

Occasionally also private medals have been struck for different States Societies or for individuals, for which the consent of the Department was in many cases asked, and never refused. Latterly, since the complaints of Mr. McCulloch, such consent has been asked, in every case, through yourself, and always granted. It is manifest, therefore, that what appears to that gentleman so gross an impropriety, makes no such

impression upon others.

The trifling advantage which the Chief Coiner derives from the manufacture of medals is not at the expense of the United States, as charged. The only advantage he derives from his position is in the use of the old coining machine, now discontinued with for Mint operations. The materials & the compensation of workmen are at the Chief Coiners Charge, and the regular labors of the Mint are never interrupted. Under such circumstances I can see no ground of exception.

Having as I believe fully disproved the allegation of improper conduct in the manufacture of medals. I will take the opportunity to add that, although the law devotes no duty upon the Chief Coiner in reference to the collection & custody of dies & medals, yet at an early period after entering on my office I formed the plan of collecting in the Mint, for permanent preservation, as extensive a series as was possible of our national, State & private medal dies. I procured the former, which were in the Mint, I catalogued & arranged at once. I also obtained the cooperation of different Secretaries at Washington (Messrs. Pettit, Paulding, Spencer & Upshur) by whose aid, with much trouble on my part, I have succeeded at length in procuring a very complete series of such dies, properly arranged. Without such pains they would probably in a few years have been lost or destroyed; now they are likely to be permanently

preserved, and copies of medals from them may be, if necessary, at any time reproduced. In the Museum of medals, in Paris, we have an admirable institution where all dies, national and otherwise, are preserved, and the collection dates from the earliest ages of the art. It is sincerely to be hoped that some day a Medallie Establishment may be attached to this Mint, by authority of law, for the preserving to posterity of these "pledges of history". In the meantime, as the law assigns no duties on the subject, it is desirable that it shall be made the interest of the Chief Coiner to assume them himself, by allowing him the privilege of striking copies when required. Not for myself do I make this remark; for I shall preserve these dies, while they remain under my influence, as sacred deposits, of too great value to be neglected or lost, without regard to any ulterior interest.

Very respectfully re
Mr. Geo. H. Eckert } (Signed) Franklin Peake
Director } Chief Coiner

Mint of the United States
Phil Novem 15th 1851

Dear Sir

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of yours of the 8th inst. requesting me to communicate in writing, such circumstances as I may deem pertinent thereto; respecting a charge preferred by H. S. McCallum Esq: against the Chief Coiner of the Mint - of "malicious interference with the duties of other officers of the mint and false representations of their conduct."

Regarding your request as one of official obligation, it becomes my duty to reply as fully and impartially, as my knowledge of circumstances enables me to do; at the same time there is an apparent propriety in limiting my reply to matters more especially affecting my own office, and its consequent relations with the other departments, and the general regulations of the mint. I shall therefore attempt to state only such facts, as while affecting my own position, have appeared to me, to have a direct bearing upon the points embraced in the charge. Leaving it to your better judgment to give them such character and importance, as they may appear to you to merit.

It may be necessary here to remark, that the order of business apparently established, prior to my induction to office in the mint, was, and has continued to be, such as placed

under the immediate control of the chief coiner, much of the machinery and mechanical appliances and apparatus, used in, and essential to, the operations of the Engraver: although the preparation of the dies, as well as the engraving, is by law assigned to the Engraver of the Mint.

In my introduction to the office I hold, I was instructed by the Director, that the ~~fore~~man of the chief coiner, was the person on whom I was expected to call, for any mechanical aid or assistance required in my operations; which instruction was given in the presence of the chief coiner.

To the best of my recollection (for I have not the precise date) it was some time in May or June 1849 after the design for the reverse of the double eagle had been made by me and approved. It became necessary for me to prepare a model from this design for the original die. I accordingly called on the person before mentioned to prepare me a metallic disk for this purpose: but shortly found that he was not permitted to proceed with ~~the~~ work; when I inquired the cause I learned that the chief coiner had forbidden him, asserting that it would not answer, or was of no use; on my making known however to the Director this interference, the workman was allowed to proceed agreeably to my directions. I do not pretend to give any character to this act of interference, it was the occasion of delay for the time, and its object to me

was unaccountable.

On the 26th of January 1850, on a trial of my original dies for the double eagle, at the large press in the room of the Chief Coiner and in his presence several pieces were struck in gold; which were not altogether satisfactory, as the impression was not so full as desired; the chief coiner particularly objecting, that the work on the dies was too deep. Wishing to remedy this defect; in order to guide me intelligently in the delicate work yet required for the perfecting the dies, I deemed it important to have by me for the time, one of the pieces then struck, and requested the temporary use of one of them from this officer for this purpose; he refused my request on the ground, at first, of some alledged or apprehended difficulty in making up his accounts; I then offered to deposit the value in his hands from my own pocket, solely with a view to expedite the public business, when he refused absolutely and on any terms to allow me the use of one (of) these pieces; and on my inquiry, as to what he expected me to do, under such circumstances, - with some hesitation he remarked that I might have an impression in silver: - this alternative I had to accept; but it was neither satisfactory nor safe for my operation - from the difference in the malleability of the metal, and not being that in which the coin was to appear.

I need scarcely remark to you, I presume,

that proper facilities for obtaining true impressions of his work, are of the utmost importance to every engraver who has any reputation for skill in his art, to maintain, and in ^{the} case of the engraver of the mint, cannot be dispensed with, without danger, or manifest detriment to the public estimation of his official capacity.

The facts above stated were communicated in writing, to the Director of the mint at the time; but so far as I have information he did not see fit to interfere for my protection. A few days subsequently to this transaction however, he called on me privately in my room, when he stated that he had the painful intelligence to communicate to me, that my removal from office had been determined on by the government, and advised me, rather urgently, to send in my resignation without delay. I was surprised and troubled at this communication because it was under the circumstances, a mortifying termination to a severe and painful effort to sustain singlehanded the recently arduous requirements of my office. I knew that I had labored faithfully; and I had never known my character as an artist to be seriously assailed.

In the absence of positive information, these incidents were of a character to excite the suspicion of secret and unfriendly interference: I resolved, not to use the haste that was recommended in throwing up my Commission; but first to seek an interview with the Secretary of the Treasury, who was then Mr Meredith of this City, and with whom from my previous acquaintance I had not the slightest cause to apprehend an unfriendly purpose.

My interview disclosed the fact, that misrepresentations had been made to him, respecting my official qualifications,

of an insidious and injurious character. As he did not offer to communicate the authority, I did not learn it. I asked no more than the privilege of making my own statement of facts in relation to the matters at issue; which I did not fear to challenge the world to invalidate.

The effect of my statement then made in writing to the Secretary, authorizing him to make any use of it, required by the public welfare, may be inferred from the indefinite postponement of the measure advised by my superior officer.

I assign no particular character to the act of interference I have last narrated; but as my representation made to the Director at the time, failed to obtain for me any apology, explanation or redress; and as the characteristic urbanity of this officer (the Director) in my intercourse with him ~~at~~ other points, precluded to my mind, the idea that any unfriendliness towards me could originate with him, I was necessarily compelled to look to some other source for the hostility developed by the matters transpiring immediately thereafter, as I have stated, and these being not without influence upon my own conclusions: I could not detach them from a fair statement, without depriving you of some of the advantages of inference proposed by myself.

The "legal devices and inscriptions," on the coin, are expressly included in the law, designating the duties of the Engraver of the Mint; and are not mentioned in connection with the duties of any other officer; which (in my view) gives him the proper control of this matter, and it cannot therefore pertain to another. The Chief Coiner, however, has interfered in this matter, on certain occasions, and as I think, improperly, if not prejudicially.

After the dies for the double eagle had been completed so far as to be struck, the Chief Coiner demanded that the

position of the head of liberty on the obverse die, should be changed; Contrary to my judgment and wishes: and which, if his demand had been complied with, must have delayed the issue of the coin, and thereby have hindered the public service; while the alteration he required, was not desired nor approved of so far as I could learn, by any other than himself; and was as a matter of right, beyond the limit of his official duties.

After I had completed the engraving of the dies for the Three Cent Coin from designs of my own which had previously been approved by the Director, and a satisfactory trial had been made of them; an effort was made to substitute other devices, that had been prepared for another coin, fourteen or fifteen years before; instead of those which I had made; contrary to my judgment, and not in accordance with the act of Congress providing for the issue of this coin. Circumstances at the time, led me to suppose that the Chief Coiner was not only cognizant of, but mainly instrumental in this attempt, to supersede my labors; but as I had no intercourse with him directly, I do not desire to say that such was the fact. In this, as in other cases, I have not sought to trace the origin of the annoyance it occasioned me; preferring the peaceful occupation of my official duties.

With very sincere respect

I remain &c

G. V. Eckert Esq

Director of the Mint

(Signed)

James B Longacre

Washington City 18 Nov. 1850

Dear Sir,

The enclosed slip was transmitted to me yesterday by the President.

You will please inform me as early as possible of the facts alluded to in it

Wm Patterson
Phil.

Yours respectfully
(signed) Theodore Tilton

7

From the "Evening Express", New York, Thursday Morning Nov 14, 1850

To the Editors,

An article appeared in your evening paper a short time since, setting forth the disgraceful manner in which the medals ordered by Congress to be presented to Gen Taylor were executed in the Mint. The writer of the article has felt bound to inform the public of the full extent of the abuses practiced in the Mint at Philadelphia with reference to the manufacture of medals.

For some time past the officers of the Mint have been in the habit of making medals, not only for the Government, to be distributed to the Indian tribes, or presented to our victorious generals, but also for private persons and corporations, and this business is said to have been carried on for their profit, and to an extent which has added largely to the compensation of their officers.

It does not appear by the published laws of the U.S. that Congress has given authority to persons employed in the Mint thus to convert it into a workshop for their private gain, nor even that medals may be made in the Mint for the government as a source of pecuniary benefit to its salaried officers. But however that may be, there certainly can be no sufficient valid excuse offered to justify those officers in employing the facilities of the Mint, at the expense of the U.S. to make medals for private persons and institu-

time, and for their own gain, thereby interfering and competing with the legitimate art and industry of the country, to the disadvantage thereof. Such protection of industry is protection with a vengeance. The whole business is corrupt & the officers engaged in it deserve the severest censure. And if the President has overlooked such official misconduct, then Congress should see to it, and deal with those who have thus abused the responsible station they occupy as they justly merit."

Minist of the United States
Philad: 23 Nov. 1850

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge your communication of the 18th inst, enclosing a clip from the New York Express censuring the practice of making medals in the Mint, and in reply to the President's request, indicated by ~~it~~ you, that the matter should be investigated, I beg leave to present the following explanations.

It may be stated, first, that the engraving and striking of medals, national or private, has no place in our Code of Mint Laws, and of course forms no part of the functions of the Mint.

In the next place it is obvious that the making of medals is an art not to be looked for, at least not in any perfection, in a new country, or in a country where the arts are comparatively in their infancy. ~~Now~~ Consequent

ly, until within a very recent date, there has always been some difficulty in executing orders of this kind from Congress, or from the Departments of War, and the Navy, or other sources. At first the dies were engraved in France; afterwards we had to avail ourselves of the aid of a very moderate artist from Europe, who resided here awhile, & eventually went back again for want of employment; and subsequently to this attempts were made to accomplish the object by a larger use, and combination of mechanical means, such as the electrotypes & portrait-lathe.

But beyond the difficulty of procuring suitable dies, there was no facility in the country, except at the Mint, for the various mechanical, but critical operations requisite for striking the medal. Consequently the Departments have always, hitherto, put this work into the charge of the Chief-Coiner of the Mint, and paid him for attending to it. And, at various times, that officer has obtained permission, to do the same thing for States, Corporations & individuals.

Within a very recent period, we may say three or four years, this branch of art has received a forward impulse, and we have now, especially in New York & Boston, medal-engravers whose productions are honorable to themselves & to the country. It would seem, from the allegations in this printed article, that these artists are perfectly qualified also to prepare the plan-chets & strike the medals. Without yield-

in the question of ^{our} superiority or facilities in that respect, it may be suggested that the friends of those gentlemen, instead of using anonymous newspaper attacks, should have applied at once to the Department for the next job of this kind. As it is, and to obviate the jealousies which seem to have originated these attacks, it is a very proper subject for consideration whether, as a medal of President Fillmore is now due, the preparation of the die should not be given for competition amongst artists, in which case the striking of the medals may be, as heretofore, confided to the Coiner of the Mint, or to the Engraver of the dies as may be preferred. The Department could then judge whether a change of this kind would be advantageous.

In the last place, as it is competent to the Secy of the Treasury to forbid the further striking of private medals, or to allow it under specific restrictions, that subject is respectfully referred to his decision. I think it proper, however, to state, in view of the charges alleged of a personal gain to the Chief Coiner from this official position, that I have his assurance, in a written memorandum which he has presented to me on this subject, that "the use of the machinery is all the advantage accruing to him, and does not in any way interfere with the usual Mint operations."

I have only further to add, in proof that there is no disposition at the Mint to exclude competent assistance in the making of medals,

when obtainable, that Mr. Wright of New York
was selected by me, at the request of the Depart-
ment, and on the Recommendation of the
Chief Coiner, to execute the dies for the Scott
& Taylor (Buena Vista) medals, and also
of the medal ordered lately for the offi-
cers and men of certain foreign navies, who
rendered assistance at the shipwreck of
the Somers. When the first Taylor medal
was executed, Mr. Wright was unknown
to us.

Very respectfully
your faithful servt
(signed) A. M. Patterson
Director

Hon. Thomas Corwin }
Secy of the Treasury. }

Washington August 3^d 1852

Sir,

In the month of October last, I had the honor to receive from you a Communication dated Oct. 15th 1851, enclosing copy of a report from G. M. Eckert, Director of the Mint, dated Oct. 14th 1851, - and informing me that the Department would, in accordance with said report, authorize a trial of my Process for refining gold, to be made at the Mint, in my presence, if any loss of gold which might accrue should be borne by me.

In the aforesaid report of the Director, ^{copy of which marked I is hereto appended.} he had not confined himself to matters relative to the expediency of ^{the} trial recommended by him; but had also incidentally remarked upon charges, which I had preferred, in my letter to the President of August 8th 1851, against Professor James C. Booth, Meltin and Refiner of the Mint, and in exculpation of said Booth.

In my reply to you, of Nov. 13th 1851, I therefore said: "for the present, I forbear from remarks upon said report, except in relation to the practical question of a trial of my process for refining gold, to be made at the Mint, and in my presence". It was my wish to establish the merits of said process, by successful workings at the Mint, and thus to show that it is free from the objections which had been urged against it by Prof. Booth, and by Dr Patterson, the late Director of the Mint. And, therefore, it appeared to me proper to forbear, meanwhile, from the discussion of an issue, which might preclude free intercourse between the present Director and myself, ~~thereby~~ ^{thereby} favoring the progress of the aforesaid trial. There was a fitness in this forbearance, and in my determination to observe towards the officers ^{of the Mint} with whom the progress of said trial might require me to hold personal intercourse, that courtesy which their official

relations would entitle them.

163.

But the proposed trial having been made, and the results thereof being reported by me to the Department in a printed pamphlet herewith presented, I now deem it proper to submit, for your information, such other facts and remarks, as seem appropriate and necessary, in further reply to your aforesaid letter of the 18th of October 1857, with reference to matters apart from said trial, but alluded to by said Director in his abovementioned letter of Oct.^r 14th 1857 to the Department.

In the first place, I should observe that I had found it necessary to complain of the official proceedings of the Meltin and refining and other officers of the Mint, in my aforesaid letter to the President of August 1st 1857, asking that a just trial of my method of refining gold should be made at the Mint, in my presence, for the reason, that said proceedings had been, in my belief, regardless of my own rights and of important public interests. But, I had neither any purpose, nor any wish, to pursue them further than said rights and interests should render necessary, and less than this no one could justly expect of me.

When I received the letter of the Department to me, dated August 12th 1857, informing me that the Director of the Mint had been instructed to investigate the charges and representations contained ⁱⁿ my aforesaid letter to the President, and requesting me to be prepared to give said Director such information and explanations as he might require, I therefore addressed to him a letter, dated August 13th 1857, tendering them to him.

Subsequently, I went to see the Director, with the purpose of ascertaining what course of proceeding he would desire to pursue, and then submitted for his consideration the suggestion, that it would be proper to furnish to the officers of the Mint

charged
by me with misconduct; copies of said charges, with specifications
of the facts upon which they were founded, which I would prepare,
that a full opportunity for defense, by answering, producing
evidence, ^{and} confronting and cross examining witnesses who might
be called to establish the charges, should be afforded to said
officers. To this proposition, the Director replied, that the manner
of conducting the investigation should, he presumed, be left to
himself and the Secretary of the Treasury.

He, also, informed me that, - as said investigation related to
three distinct subjects, to wit, the question of the expediency of
trying my aforesaid Process, in my presence; the charges
against Prof. Booth, Melton and Refiner; and the charges against
Franklin Peale, Corner; - it would most accord with his views of
the public interest and with his own convenience, to dispose ^{first}
first of the question of a trial of my process, and then, to investigate
the charges against said officers separately. And, therefore, he
orally requested me to furnish such information as I deemed
requisite to enable him to decide correctly with reference to
said trial.

Accordingly, I addressed to the Director a communication,
dated Sept. 26th 1857, copy of which, ^{marked #6} is annexed, setting
forth reasons why a trial of my Process, conducted by myself,
should be made at the Mint; and for his information, I
enclosed copies of my memorial to Congress of February 25th 1857,
and of my letter to the Department of February 28th 1857.

Meanwhile, the Director had by letter, dated August 22^d
1857, requested in relation to the charges prepared against
Franklin Peale, Corner, in my aforesaid letter to the President, that
I would "specially detail them in writing, with a reference to
the particular action or actions, which I might consider infractions
of official duty, and to the testimony on which I relied for their
proof." I furnished him, therefore, with written specifications,

dated September 24th 1851, ~~copy of which is annexed~~; and upon being informed, by a letter from him, dated Sept. 26th 1851, that his investigation of the Charges against said Peale would be conducted as an administrative inquiry, and being in said letter requested to furnish the names of persons whom I wished him to examine with reference to said Charges, I accordingly, gave him the names of said persons, and mentioned the facts that, I believed, were known to them, and about which they might be interrogated respectively.

But in relation to the Charges preferred against Prof. Booth, Miller and Refiner of the Mint, in my aforesaid letter to the President of August 1st 1851, the Director neither requested, nor has he received from me, written or oral specifications; nor did he either seek, or receive, from me any evidence to substantiate the same, except that portion which is contained in the Correspondence relative to my aforesaid process, published in my memorial to Congress of Feb. 25th 1851.

He had proposed to consult his own convenience, by investigating said Charges, independently of matters connected with a trial of my process, after he should have disposed thereof; and I had acquiesced in that decision. Nevertheless, in his ^{aforesaid} report to the Department, of October 14th 1851, advising a trial of said process, he took leave of his own proposition; and without either having extended to me the opportunity of presenting specifications and producing testimony to substantiate the Charges I had made against Prof. Booth; or having made other than an ex parte administrative inquiry into or about the subjects of said Charges; if indeed he made any inquiry - he presumed to report thereupon, and in so doing made exculpatory representations, which are inconsistent with the public interests and with the truth.

Concerning the charge, that "the energy and working
"hours of Prof. Booth have been devoted, rather to his private affairs,
"beyond the precincts of the Mint, than to his public duties therein, since
"he was appointed to his present office"; and my reasoning in
"connexion therewith, "that workmen, however skilful they may
"be in the performance of familiar routine operations, yet need,
"when improvements are to be introduced, to be guided by the officer, whose
"science, skill and forethought, it is by law contemplated should
"preside over all the work entrusted to his charge, so as to induce
"suitable economy and correct results; and whose habitual absence
"is, therefore, inconsistent with the public interests and in derogation
"of law," the Director saw fit to report as follows:

"Of the charges against the Meltin and refining for "habitual
"absence inconsistent with the public interests and in derogation of
"law," I may remark, that whether Mr. Booth be absent a
"greater or less time than his predecessor, I cannot pretend to
"say. Since my connexion with the Mint, he has faithfully
"discharged the duties of his office, nor have I any reason to
"suppose that he neglected them previously. The operations
"of his department are conducted with rapidity, energy and
"ability, and exhibit a wastage far within the legal limits
"of allowance".

What signification the Director of the Mint may have attached
to the order of the Department requiring him to investigate the charges
which I had preferred against his subordinate, Prof. Booth, I
am at a loss to determine. But, if I should inductively seek it,
in his proceedings, and in the words of his exculpatory letter to you
of Oct. 14. 1854, it would be this, - that he considered himself
instructed to prepare some sort of a defense of said Booth. And
strange, indeed, is the defense he has made.

He begins by informing you that he "cannot pretend to
say, whether Mr. Booth be absent a greater or less time, than his

Predecessor:— Culpable then as I have charged that Prof. Booth is, in his neglect of his official duties, as Melter and Refiner of the Mint, the Director, when ~~required~~ ordered to investigate that Charge, — without knowing or heeding upon what evidence it is based, and without inquiry concerning the manner in which the duties of that office were formerly discharged by myself, the "Predecessor" to whom he refers, — can only find, that he Cannot pretend to say, whether I may not have been as bad as said Booth, — as if it would prove him to be white to misimake that I may possibly have been black.

Certainly, a Peculiarity ^{of perception} must either Characterize, or have at the time befallen the Director, that he should thus have set up an avowal of his ignorance, in relation to my comparative attention to duty, in exculpation of neglect thereof by Prof. Booth; especially, when he might have fully informed himself by inquiring of Persons at his elbow. And this Profession of ignorance he has made to you, as if it were a fulfilment of your order, that he should prosecute an investigation, and report the results thereof.

If such were his ideas of an investigation, Prof. Booth may congratulate himself that it was a ^{proceeding} ~~matter~~ so mild, so unmeaning, so free from all purpose to hold him responsible for any neglect of duty of which he ~~may have~~ had been guilty; and so ready to find for him the apology, that the Director "cannot pretend to say, whether W. Booth be absent a greater or less time than his Predecessor."

There would appear to be in this unpretending acknowledgement, offered as an imagined vindication, a simplicity very uncommon. And it is pleasant to find that, upon this subject, the Director seems to have attained a consciousness of ignorance, which I could wish were the beginning of knowledge.

concerning the imputation which his remark casts upon myself, the "predecessor" and the Comparison which it challenges, I affirm, and the Director can neither show nor learn to the contrary; that the avocation of nearly the whole of my time and my constant personal attention to the duties of the office of Melter and Refiner were as well known to all the persons in the Mint and to those doing business therewith, as have the absence of Prof. Booth from the Mint, during working hours, and the daily avocation of the greater part of said hours to his private business, since he succeeded to said office, been habitual and notorious.

Since the Director might, therefore, have readily informed himself, by simply asking those around him, concerning the time I devoted, and the personal attention I gave, to the performance of the duties of Melter and Refiner, he has cast upon me an unjust ^{and false} imputation. Yet, he may not have intended to do this, and may not be conscious that he has done it; for the mirror of his perceptions seems to clothe things in such varied ^{lights} shades and colors, and to exhibit them in such distorted forms, that he may might justly be held innocent of having intentionally imputed any thing to anybody.

However, when exculpating Prof. Booth, as Melter and Refiner, from my aforesaid charge, the Director must have known, - for it is notorious in the Mint of the United States and in the City of Philadelphia, - that said Booth carries on, in a private laboratory, in said City, the business of making chemical analyses and giving instruction therein to pupils; also, that he is concerned in the ~~business of~~ ^{of} manufacturing oxide of Cobalt for the use of Potters; and that his time is chiefly occupied in these affairs, instead of in the fulfillment of duties which he

should discharge in person at the Mint, but has devolved upon a young chiefly upon workmen, though in fact upon a young substitute, who does not possess ~~the~~ the scientific and metallurgic attainments which are requisite in the person holding the office of melter and refiner.

Moreover, as the Director himself had informed me, that he ^{had} sought in vain, for several days, to find Prof. Booth in his apartments at the Mint, I am constrained to believe that, in attempting to defend him against my aforesaid charge, said Director has stated, perhaps unconsciously, what he might and should have known, and what Prof. Booth, many persons at the Mint and I do know to be untrue.

And I may here add, that, after Prof. Booth had accepted the office of melter and refiner of the Mint, he informed me, in explanation of his apparently inconsistent conduct of having first declined to be a candidate for, and then having sought, his appointment, that he would not have accepted said office, if the then Director of the Mint had not promised him, that he should not be required to devote his time to the duties thereof to such an extent as would impair his private business - a communication which, if it had been made to me previously to my having recommended his appointment and its having been conferred upon him, ^{would have} caused me to refrain from giving it.

Nor is the manner in which the business of the melting department of the Mint has been and now is conducted creditable to Prof. Booth or to the Mint; for it is a fact, which the adjusted accounts of its operations show, that from the 14th of November 1850 to the 1st of April 1851, the depositors of gold bullion were charged full price for separating their ^{to wit, five cents per ounce,} silver from their gold, and then deprived of nearly the half thereof, to wit, five per cent of silver left in the gold coins by the melter and refiner, and charged to the depositors as alloy, amounting to \$42759.84, - four fifths of which should have been separated in the refining department, and would have been if said operations had been conducted by ^{this} that officer, with proper "energy and ability."

This Charge of five per cent of silver alloy could not legally have been made without the concurrence of the Treasury Department, required in relation to all ~~mint~~ Charges made by the Mint to depositors, by Section 18 of an Act of Congress, approved January 18. 1837. It was a measure which could have originated only with the officers of the Mint; and their object must have been to avoid asking for, or to obviate the necessity of, additional transfers of public money to the Mint; and thus to screen the inefficiency of the melting and refining department, whilst they affected to be extracting the silver from millions of dollars of gold bullion; when in fact nearly the half of that silver was left in the gold coins, notwithstanding that the depositors paid to have it separated therefrom. This was not only an injury but a wrong done to the depositors. And if to legalize said injury, the requisite sanction of the ~~Department~~ Department was sought, it could only have been obtained, I presume, through a seeming necessity and by reason of ~~having~~ misplaced confidence.

Such indeed was the inefficiency of the melting and refining department of the Mint, during said period, that, notwithstanding the amount of the public monies placed to the use of the Mint for the accommodation of depositors of bullion by making advances to them, had been increased from one million to \$4,841,150 dollars, - with loss of interest to the United States upon this amount, at the rate of six per cent per annum. - yet, on the 31st of December 1850, the unpaid deposits amounted to the sum of \$4,220,946.36, as exhibited by the abstract of certificates filed with the adjusted accounts of the Mint, for that quarter.

Prof. Booth employing for quantation two pounds of silver & one of gold, and with a charge to ^{the} depositors of five cents per ounce, for materials and labor used in parting silver from gold was by the late Director, and is by the present Director, permitted to leave as alloy or unextracted silver in the refined gold.

a quantity equal in weight to two per cent of the weight of said gold; and in November 1850 he obtained permission to leave ^{unextracted} five per cent of silver in the gold, without any abatement from the said charge of five cents for parting. Whereas I, working with the same apparatus and employing three pounds of silver to one of gold, and the charge to reporters being only four cents per ounce, for materials and labor used in parting, was required to extract, and did extract, all the silver except one per cent. And when I invented, constructed and first put that apparatus in operation; and as an experiment employed in quantation only two pounds of silver to one of gold, seeking thereby to economize acid, silver and labor, the result showing that one and a half per cent of silver was left in the gold, this was deemed proof of the failure, not of my experiment, but of my new apparatus; and it was then urged, that it ought to be immediately torn down and the use of bottles resumed, if the next refining of gold made with it, should not extract all except one per cent of the silver from the gold; as I maintained that it would ~~and~~, if the usual proportion of three pounds of silver to one of gold should be employed, and as I then by actual work showed that it did. In Prof. Booth's current refinings the proportion of silver that is left in the gold, nearly two per cent, is greater than that which was deemed good cause to condemn even an experiment in mine, and which if it had not been reduced to one per cent in my subsequent operations, would have been considered sufficient reason for the destruction of said apparatus.

The aforesaid apparatus, which I had invented, constructed, and left ready to be used by Prof. Booth, was in

all respects suitable, except that it needed ^{an additional or} a larger boiler for operations of greater magnitude; - therefore, as the quantity of work subsequently increased it was only necessary to proportionally enlarge the apparatus, as was done but with culpable delay; for Congress had by an Act of May 15. 1850 made an ample ^{and} appropriation, for \$20,000, for this and other purposes. Prof. Booth had therefore no excuse for being without the necessary power to do promptly and effectively all the refining work required of him. Yet, by reason of the inadequacy of his arrangements, between Nov. 14. 1850 and April 1. 1851, when the officers of the Mint were anxious to magnify its efficiency and operations, the sum of \$42,759.84. in silver, is shown as aforesaid ^{to have been} lost to the depositors and the country, or virtually thrown away. - Four fifths of which, or \$34,207.87 might and should have been saved by ^{merely enlarging the apparatus,} ~~proper~~, and would have been by a truly energetic and able officer, properly attentive to his public duties, and less engrossed with his private affairs. In this nonperformance of work, notwithstanding the full charge for doing it had been exacted from the depositors, the present Director may find evidence of "rapidity"; for rapid, and reckless, and wasteful and wrong, it most assuredly was; but, if he can perceive it to be, on the part of Prof. Booth, the manifestation ^{either} of "energy and ability," or of a "faithful discharge of the duties of his office," ~~then this~~ ^{is} more than I can discern or acknowledge.

And from personal observation during my presence at the Mint last winter, I know that the usual absence of the Minter & refiner from its working apartments, and the consequent substitution of an unqualified assistant, or rather of two good principal workmen in his place, - neither of whom is legally commissioned, so to give orders to and direct the other workmen - is an arrangement productive of influences inconsistent

with harmonious, skilful and careful work.

The Director is also mistaken in supposing that it is true that the operations of the melting and refining department show that the wastage is very far within the legal limits of allowance, - for credits are arbitrarily allowed to the melter and refiner, and bullion is delivered to him without charge, to such an extent, that his actual wastage is so masked that its true amount is not ascertained and, therefore, is not exemplified, in any of the accounts.

With reference to the remaining charges against Prof. Booth, melter and refiner, preferred in my aforesaid letter of August 11th 1857, to the President, they were not, as softened down in the language of the Director, for "unfairness in the experiments made in his department with a view to test the practicability and expediency and expense of Mr. McCulloch's method of refining gold," but they were rather that said Booth had manifested want of "integrity," in that he "failed to demonstrate his alleged invention to be such as he had professed it to be when he was bargaining for an interest in mine," &c. I affirmed that "various experiments designed to test the merits of the process of Mr. Booth were tried, by himself, in the mint, at Philadelphia. The results of which, - withheld for a long time from my knowledge by him, though interrogated by me, as a party of interest, with reference thereto, - were finally admitted by him and reported by the late Director of the Mint, D. Patterson, to be such as to have demonstrated the aforesaid invention of said Booth to be destitute of ~~value~~ efficiency, and therefore of no value."

And I said; with respect to the interest of Prof. Booth, that, "as his own process proved upon trial by

"himself, with every facility, to be destitute of value, he
"ceased to have any equitable or just claim upon mine".
And that I consequently, demanded and had obtained
"from him a release of the moiety of my invention, which
"had been conveyed to him in exchange for a moiety of
"his alleged invention".

Now these are grave charges, involving something
more than mere "unfairness in experiments", implying
rather that an officer of the Mint had been guilty of
of a transaction, in which he sought to acquire and to
hold an interest in a valuable grant by assigning an
interest in an alleged invention by himself but destitute
of efficiency and value, — a transaction to which I shall
not apply the term that would most aptly designate it;
and which I tolerated only while I attended to the assurances
which that officer gave to me orally, and had solemnly
made, in relation to the value of his alleged invention, a
confidence to which they have been proved not to have been
entitled.

In relation to this grave charge, the Director casually
observes that: "as to the want of value ⁱⁿ of Mr. Booth's inven-
-tion, it is most emphatically denied by him". What
else was to have been expected than that he would
deny it? Did the Director suppose he would confess
it? Certainly, if the Director had reasoned from his
"experience of human nature" he could not have
expected such a thing. Prof. Booth had in his
meetings both certified to the great value of my method
of refining gold, and denied that it possessed such
value. He had officially recommended, in writing,
its adoption and use in the refining work of the Mint;
and then had subsequently written that he could not

conscientiously have recommended it. What signifies, then, the aforesaid denial of a man, so inconsistent in what he states; especially when his admission to the contrary, would be his own condemnation? And what additional ^{force} does emphasis give to a denial, if it lacks the basis of truth?

Wherefore, if the Director desired to ascertain the facts of this matter, did he not seek information of others, as well as of the party accused? And wherefore did he not extend to me the opportunity of furnishing proof in substantiation of what I had charged? I was ready and prepared to establish all that I had asserted; and the facts, as I have stated them to be, I can and will prove whenever I ~~am~~ ^{may be} called upon to do so - if an opportunity of adducing testimony shall be properly extended to me.

How can Prof. Booth, notwithstanding the ex parte proceedings and exculpatory report of the Director of the Mint, escape from the discredit which his acts in this matter have fastened upon him, or recover in the esteem of honorable men from the position in which these acts have placed him.

Not a little curious also is the attempt which the Director has made at an argument in defence of Prof. Booth. He first declares it to be an "undeniable fact" that Prof. Booth "had a direct pecuniary interest in the successful issue" of ^{the} experiments upon my method of refining gold tried at the Mint, under his supervision. He asserts that said Booth "having become legal owner of one half of Mr. McCulloch's ~~process~~ Patent would have shared with Mr. McC., the sum appropriated by Congress". Then

adverts to the fact
he ~~admits~~ that I had already denied said interest and
said ownership, for the reason that the assignment made
~~to~~ ^{by} me ~~to~~ said Booth was ab initio void for want of Consideration,
his alleged useful invention being "destitute of efficiency and,
therefore, ~~without~~ ^{of no} value", — Concerning which the Director
remarks; "I ~~cannot~~ ^{can} express no opinion as to the
law of this view, and as to the want of value in W. Booth's
invention, it is most emphatically denied by him, —
but supposing both the law and the fact to be as stated,
it is quite certain that, while conducting these
experiments W. Booth believed himself to have a
pecuniary interest in their success, and must be
inferred to have ^{acted} accordingly." Now the amount of all
this is; that the "undeniable fact" of the Director is an
incorrect inference from transactions about the legal
effect of which he "expresses no opinion"; that Prof. Booth
~~has~~ made an emphatic denial, ~~which I have~~ ^{and} that his
invention wants value; and that the Director came to an
abiding Conclusion that it is quite certain that said Booth
believed he had an interest and must be inferred to have
acted accordingly.

Of the ~~expressed~~ emphatic denial of Prof. Booth, already
somewhat discussed, I may now say: that it is without force
as it was made after he had executed a release of all
interest in my process for refining gold; which release was
demanded exclusively upon the ground, that his alleged
useful invention for the same purpose is not, and never
was, of any value; and which demand was made
coupled with the declaration that, unless said release was
promptly given, it would be sought through a Court of
equity.

And of the conclusion of the Director, I would, first

observe that it is not generally ~~very~~^{as} easy to discern
with certainty what our fellow men may or may
as it is to know what they ought to have believed.
not have believed. But, as the late Director of the
Mint, D. Patterson, did, in his letter to you of March
18th 1857, make explanations, which he ~~deemed~~^{considered} necessary
after seeing my published memorial to Congress of
February 24th 1857; and, as the experiments tried in
the Mint and deemed, by said Director Patterson,
conclusive against my ~~alleged~~^{alleged} process were made
subsequently to his aforesaid letter; and, as my above-
mentioned memorial did set forth, that the patented
process of Prof. Booth & Messrs. Booth and Morfit "has
proved an utter failure, under the management of
Prof. Booth himself, so that the union between us by
mutual assignment, recorded in the Patent Office,
has, in all probability, been without ^{valuable} consideration on
their part, and would, therefore, be void in law
and equity"; - and as said Booth and Morfit
did upon my demand, based, as aforesaid, upon
the aforesaid ^{alleged} want of consideration, release to me
in July 1857, by an instrument of writing duly recorded,
the assignment I had made to them; - And, as, not-
withstanding all these facts, the ^{present} Director seems to
consider it "quite certain", that while conducting
these experiments Mr. Booth believed himself
to have a pecuniary interest in their success; -
Therefore, I am willing to let said Director entertain
his opinion, and "Credat Judoceus Appellat, non ego";
for my mind is so constituted that it cannot see
this certainty, and is of little faith with reference thereto.
Upon the remarks made by the Director, in his
aforesaid report of Oct. 24. 1857, with respect to the

motives of the official action of his predecessor, Dr. Patterson, I have to state: that I have been informed, that this gentleman had, for some months before he resigned his office, been so unwell that he could not justly be deemed responsible for the due progress of operations in the Mint; and as this may have been the fact, it would be ungenerous, and not, under such circumstances, accord to him, now a private citizen and in impaired ^{health} ~~position~~, the full benefit of a statement made to explain official proceedings, which were wrongful to me; and of which I had, therefore, at the time to complain. But, for this wrong I do not entertain any unkind feeling towards him; and if it ~~be~~ ^{be} true, as I believe it ~~is~~ ^{to be}, that he acted in these matters, rather upon ^{the} representations of ~~the~~ subordinates around him, than upon his own investigations and unbiassed judgement, then are they the more culpable for the part they played, in that they abused his confidence and brought upon him a measure of censure which was justly and chiefly, if not exclusively their own.

Concerning the charges which I preferred against Franklin Peale, the Coroner of the Mint, and the specifications upon which they are founded, I may remark: that I believe the Director of the Mint has inquired into one of them, that which relates to the accusations of said Peale upon the engraver of the Mint, James B. Longacre Esq., an artist of high reputation, a worthy gentleman, and a good & faithful officer, and to the clandestine misrepresentations of the work of this gentleman, made by said Peale in the hope & to deprive him of office; and that the results of the inquiry were such as fully sustained the charge I had made and all I had specified in relation to it; which I knew would be the case, from the contents of his letter to me of Sept. 2^d 1851, copy whereof is annexed, ^{marked} ~~&~~ [&] of his official communications

referred to therein, and which should be on file.

Whether the Director has investigated any other of said charges and specifications against W. Peale, each of which ~~is~~ I believe to be as well founded as that just mentioned, or has reported upon either, I do not know. But, when he shall have done so, and his report shall have become known to me, I may make such remarks thereupon as shall seem appropriate and necessary.

My presence at the Mint, during ~~part~~ ^{the greater} part of the last winter caused me, however, to know that the business of making medals in the Mint is still carried on there by the Corner, as actively as ever; and I was told that this is now done with the approbation of the Treasury Department, and by the advice of the present Director; notwithstanding, that said business is not authorized by law, and is rendered practically a monopoly, by allowing the means of the Government to be used by an officer thereof, for his pecuniary gain, in unfair competition with private industry, to the protection of which the avowed policy of the present Administration is professedly most favorable.

And I do not doubt that, if the engraver of the Mint had countenanced and assisted in the medal making business, he would neither have been incurred the animosity of W. Peale, nor have been calumniated by him.

Very respectfully
Your Obedt. Servt.

Hon. Thomas Corwin
Secretary of the Treasury

Rich. J. McCulloch

104
Mint of the United States.
Phil^a Oct. 14th 1851.

Sir

A memorial of Prof. Richard S. McCulloch to the President of the United States was enclosed to me in a letter from the Department, of the 11th of August last, with the request that I would make the necessary investigations and inquiries into the Charges therein alleged against officers of the Mint, and report the result to the Department, and also as to the expediency of causing Mr. McCulloch's method of refining gold to be again tried at the Mint.

The Charges alleged, are against the chief Coiner, Franklin Peale, for misconduct, which the memorial states, proves him, "flagrantly unfit for the official position he now holds."

— Against the Melter & Refiner, James C. Booth, for, "habitual absence from the Mint, inconsistent with the public interest, and in derogation of Law" — and also against the same officer for unfairness in the experiments made in his department with a view to test the practicability & expediency of Mr. McCulloch's method of refining gold — and the official proceedings of the late Director, in regard to the same experiments are also impeached.

Respecting the Charges against Mr. Peale, I am at present, not prepared to make a report —

of the charges against the Meltzer & Refinery, for "habitual
absence, inconsistent with the public interests, and in
derogation of Law" I may remark that whether Mr. Booth
be about a greater or less time than his predecessor
I cannot pretend to say. Since my connection with the
Print, he has faithfully discharged the duties of his
office, nor have I any reason to suppose that he neglect-
ed them previously - The operations of his department
are conducted with rapidity, energy and ability, and
exhibit a wastage very far within the legal limits
of allowance.

In regard to the allegations of unfairness in
conducting the experiments on Mr. McCulloch's process
at the Print, it is apparent that, in as much as
I did not witness these experiments, the grounds of
any opinion I may have formed on this subject,
must be derived from the testimony of impartial
persons who were present at the trials, from a
knowledge of facts, and from a candid and unpreju-
diced review of the voluminous correspondence which
has taken place on the subject, embracing the letters of
Mr. McCulloch and Mr. Booth, & those between the late
Director and the Department.

Among the persons examined by me were Messrs
Monell & Porter, workmen, who conducted two of the
operations required by the process, and Mr. Stringfield, fellow
workman of the late John Thompson, who conducted the
third operation - The testimony of these men showed

that the experiments were made with care;
that they were directed by Mr. Booth; and that he
and the Director personally supervised the operation
& seemed anxious that the experiments should succeed.

The impression left on the minds of these
interviewees was, that nothing requisite to the success of
the experiments was left undone - (*) There is a strong,
almost inevitable inference that this was the case,
derived from the ^{undoubtedly} fact, that, at the time, these experiments
were tried under his supervision, the Miller & Reformer
had a direct pecuniary interest in securing their
successful issue. Having become legal owner of
one half of Mr. Culler's patent, and the result
been such that the introduction of the process into
the market appeared desirable, Mr. Booth would have
shared with Mr. M.C. the sum appropriated by Congress
for the purchase of the improvement, viz. \$25,000.
Considering this fact, it appears to me to be in contradic-
-tion of all our experience of human nature, to suppose
that Mr. Booth preferred to make so great a sacrifice
of pecuniary interest, rather than give the process a
fair trial.

A view has indeed been expressed by Mr. M.C.
that as the one half of his patent was conveyed to
Mr. Booth for the one half of a patent granted to the
latter, which was pure "destitute of value", no consideration
having been given, Mr. Booth ceased to have the interest

(*)

Note. In this the Director is mistaken, as will appear by the
letter of Mr. Foster to me, of September 8th 1857, copy of which I
have appended (marked B) and who therein says: "all

Note. In this the Director is mistaken, as will appear by the
 letter of Mr. Feltus to me, of September 8.th 1857, copy of which I
 have appended (marked B) and who therein says: "all
 the affairs called occasionally to see how I got along.
 Dr. Patterson and his son Robert paid particular attention
 to some of the trials as neither there is any gold left in the
 furnace of which there is no doubt but to what amount
 I am unable to say there is no other way of getting at
 the exact amount but tearing down the furnace. But
 judging from appearance I don't think there is
 much remaining in the furnace." It is evident,
 therefore, that this workman knew that gold had
 been left in the furnace; though the ^{late} Director ascribed
 the apparent loss thereof to "volatilization". And of this
 gold, so left, I have myself since caused seventeen
ounces to be gathered in grains from said furnace, besides
 more finely ^{divided} portions in dirt & "sweep", which was not,
 I believe, assayed, though I requested that it should be done
 to consider such experiments as having been "made
 with every care" is preposterous.

H. S. McCulloch

alleged. I express no opinion as to the law
of this view, and as to the want of value in
Mr Booth's invention - it is most emphatically denied
by him - but supposing both the law and the fact to
be as stated, it is quite certain that, while conducting
these experiments Mr Booth believed himself to have
a pecuniary interest in their success, and must be
inferred to have acted accordingly.

An unfavorable inference as to the fair intention
of the late Director, has been drawn by Mr. McCulloch
from the circumstance that, although instructions
had been issued from the Department to have Mr.
McCulloch's process tried in his presence, yet the
Director failed to do so. An explanation has
already been presented on this subject in the late
Director's letter to the Department of March 18th, in
which he says - "I present as my excuse that I supposed
Mr Booth to be entirely in Mr. McCulloch's confidence
and knowing him to be also legally, and pecuniarily,
interested in a favorable result for the process, a
personal presence of Mr. McCulloch seemed useless -
the instructions from the Department, had, I supposed,
been issued in ignorance of that fact. I assure
you that I intended no disrespect to the Department
or Mr. McCulloch, in the course taken. It was very
far from my intention to do so."

in suspicion of being unfairly dealt with, in
either Mr. Booth or myself - "

I do not think it necessary to enlarge ^{further} upon
the grounds of complaint, or defence, as to the course
pursued in conducting the experiments on the
process of Mr. McCulloch - but shall conclude this
branch of the subject by expressing my conviction
that the proceedings of the late Director, and of
the Miller and Reformer relative thereto, were influenced
by a sincere desire to test its merits, and that
every facility towards ensuring its success appears
to have been afforded.

I am nevertheless of the opinion, and as
requested by the Department, to report, that it
would be expedient to have a further trial of
Mr. McCulloch's refining process at the Mint.

Among the reasons which influence me in
this opinion, the most prominent are, the desire
to ascertain, beyond controversy, whether gold, when
melted with zinc, which this process requires -
is necessarily exposed to the hazard of loss by vola-
tilization - whether it can be expeditiously and
properly toughened, and if the loss by volatilization,
and the difficulty of toughening can be overcome,
whether the process of Mr. McCulloch is so expeditious
and economical, as he believes and asserts it to be.

That such volatilization may take place in melting

metals at very high temperatures, is a fact which has been noticed by scientific authorities, but whether it is unavoidably incident to the melting of the same metals, even at the lowest possible temperature, is a problem which both in a scientific and practical point of view, it seems to be important to solve.

It may be possible that in the experiments at the Mint on Dr. McCulloch's process, by which a serious loss of gold was reported, the result arose from permitting the mixed zinc and gold to be melted at an excessive and unnecessary high temperature. I am informed however, that every precaution was taken to keep down the heat to the lowest practicable point, and think it most probable that this was effected. But the agitation of any controversy as to the fact, may be easily prevented by submitting the process to a new experiment, to be made in the presence of Dr. McCulloch - and accordingly recommend that authority for that purpose be given by the Department.

Supposing such an experiment to be authorized, and to result as may possibly be the case, in a loss of precious metal, I ask the instructions of the Department, as to how the deficiency is to be supplied - Shall the loss be thrown upon the Minter & Refiner, and subsequently compensated to him by a credit for wastage; or shall he have

The amount directly replaced to him from an ordinary fund. But either of these courses the deficiency will be recovered by the Government. But it may perhaps be thought ^{anxious} against that experiments of which the benefit accrues in fact to a private citizen, should be tried exclusively at the public charge; it may seem equitable therefore, that the loss of gold, if over and above the ordinary wastage, should be borne by Mr. McCulloch.

I respectfully refer this matter to the consideration of the Department.

Very respectfully Your Obedt Serv^t
Signed J^r Geo. W. Corbitt.

Director

Hon. Fred. Corwin.

Secretary of the Treasury.

Copy
B

Report of D.^r Eckert
Director of the Mint
to
The Secretary of the
Treasury

Oct.^r 14. 1857

With a note appended by
R. S. McCulloch

(A)

E

168

Philadelphia Sept. 2^d 1851.

My dear Sir -

You request me to inform you of what transpired in my interviews with the Secretary of the Treasury, and with the Director of the Mint, in addition to furnishing you with copies of my letters to those officers in relation to difficulties connected with the preparation of the dies for the coinage of double eagle \$¹⁰.

From the character of the letters referred to - they are, or ought to be, matters of record on the files of the offices respectively to which they were addressed for the time being they were addressed; But to obviate the difficulty of referring, I have no hesitation in supplying you from the original drafts of those letters in my hands.

With regard to interviews with those officers on the same subject, I can make no more than give the stronger points which impressed me on those occasions.

With the Secretary of the Treasury I became satisfied that my position as an officer of the government, as well as the discharge of my duties had been most unfairly represented, and that if communications emanating from the Mint, without my knowledge. One fact will suffice to shew the grounds of my conclusion. On exhibiting an impression for the dies I had just finished. he enquired with evident surprise "what had become of the dies from which it was taken?" implying that he had been informed they were broken - when at the time I knew them to be in perfect order, as I then told him.

Without the interviews which I had

compelled to seek with the Secretary of the Treasury, and the consequent explanation of difficulties that had occurred; I have reason to believe, that the misrepresentations of this and other matters pertaining to my official positions, would have been decisive, prejudicial to my character, not only as an officer of the government, but as an artist.

With the Director, I regret to say that my interviews were less satisfactory; In the first instance I found it difficult to obtain an interview without the intervention of another officer, — which rendered a confidential communication impossible; and which was in fact the primary cause of my addressing him the letter, to which reference has been made; and in which I was compelled to call his attention to the conduct towards me of the Chief Coiner in my official intercourse with that officer. To that letter a written reply was not given; the Director noticed verbally some of the points on a visit to my office room; but the complaint of official interference in my intercourse with the Chief Coiner, was not adverted to. A few days after, however, I received another visit from the Director; when he informed me that he had painful intelligence to communicate to me — which was that I was to be removed from office; that the communication from the executive authority of the government was imperative; and urged me to send in my resignation. It was the unexpected character of this interview which impelled me to seek one with the Secretary of the Treasury; from a conviction that a purpose so unfriendly on the part of that officer could only have been formed in the absence of correct information as to my position, and the proper discharge of my official duties. And which information it then became incumbent on myself to carry in such a manner as would admit of no prejudicial intervention.

The result was such as to justify the first

extent the apprehension of such a result.

Respectfully yours,

Saml B. May Jr.

Re. S. M. Bullock Esq.

Copy
of
the letter from
J. B. Langens Esq
to
R. I. McCulloch

Sept. 2^d 1857

Concerning his intercourse
with the Secretary of the Treas^y
and Director of the Mint, in
relation to Franklin Peale's
interference with and mis-
representations of his official
work.

61

Mint of the United States,

405

Philadelphia, Dec. 5, 1854,

Sir,

I have to acknowledge your favor of the 2nd inst. informing me of the appointment of George E. Childs, Esq. Chief Coiner of the Mint, and enclosing a letter to Mr. Pease stating the fact of this appointment. As that gentleman had received a similar letter from the Department, I found it unnecessary to deliver it to him. I have directed the operations of the Coining Department to be suspended except so far as may be necessary to close the accounts between the Treasurer & Chief Coiner. As this transaction involves a final settlement of that account, and embraces a surrender of all the coin, ingots, clippings and other bullion in his hands, including what is denominated "Sheeps", it will be some days before the new officer can enter upon his duties.

I have the honor to be,

With great respect,
Your faithful servant,
James Ross Snowden
Director

Hon. James Guthrie,
Sec. of the Treasury,
Washington City.

L R Snowden Esq. Director
U.S. Mint. Phil Dec 8, 1854
Mr. Keen

Acknowledge receipt
of letter of 2nd inst. containing
notice of W. Childs
appointment as Chief
Clerk of the Mint. also
state that I have ordered
a suspension of the
coining operations for
the purpose of closing
up the A/c between
the Head & Clerk prepar-
atory to the new officers
entering on the duties
of his office.

M. St. Clair 6/14
Mr. Keen